



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## DEMOSTHENES' AVOIDANCE OF BREVES

BY CHARLES D. ADAMS

In the second edition of the *Attische Beredsamkeit* (1893) Friedrich Blass gave his final statement of the "law" of the avoidance of a succession of three or more short syllables in the speeches of Demosthenes. He pointed out certain classes of apparent exceptions to the law, which he would remove by punctuation, change of spelling, elision, and similar means; he formulated other classes of exceptions which he held to be real, but permissible, and in some cases unavoidable. After eliminating these classes of exceptions, Blass showed how few cases of *breves* remained even in so long a speech as the *De corona*. But here, as in the formation of his Teubner text and that of his edition of the *De corona*, he assumed the right to use the rhythmical law as a determining factor in many cases of textual criticism. If the reading of S gave *breves*<sup>1</sup> in any given case, while the vulgate reading or a quotation in an ancient author offered a reading without the *breves*, or if the bracketing of an unnecessary word or phrase would remove the series of short syllables, Blass did not hesitate to accept the inferior manuscript authority, or to emend the text. This freedom in textual emendation in favor of his "law," and the vagueness of the formulation of some of his permissible exceptions, have tended to react against confidence in the law itself.<sup>2</sup>

It has seemed to the writer that it would be well to attempt to establish the range of this law more definitely. There is no question that the strictness of the application of the law, or principle, or rule, or tendency varies in different speeches of Demosthenes, and in different parts of the same speech. A detailed examination should begin with a speech of the highest rhetorical perfection, carefully revised for publication by Demosthenes, and of sufficient length to give variety of style. All this is found in the *De corona*. If we can

<sup>1</sup> In the following, the word *breves* and its abbreviation, *brr.*, are used for a series of three short syllables in the restricted sense defined by Blass.

<sup>2</sup> In a review of Fuhr's Teubner text (*Classical Philology*, X, 473), I have discussed at length the application of this law to textual criticism.

determine the range of the avoidance of *breves* in this speech, we may fairly use the result as a norm to be applied to other speeches, and perhaps to some extent as a test of genuineness in the case of speeches of disputed authorship. As a text for such a study of the *De corona* we must not take one which, like Blass's Teubner text (1884), has been revised under the dominant influence of the very theory that is under investigation.<sup>1</sup> Butcher's Oxford text (1903) furnishes precisely what we need: a text which follows the authority of S steadily unless the evidence, aside from all rhythmical considerations, is conclusive against it. While Butcher usually introduced such regular elision and punctuation as would eliminate *breves* which were only apparent, he never pressed even this practice into the service of a theory, and he never recognized rhythmical considerations as justifying the acceptance of inferior manuscript readings. His text is therefore a safe one for our investigation. It is to be remembered, however, that even the best manuscript testimony as to elision and the use of *ν* movable is of no value, and is properly ignored by Butcher. S itself is utterly inconsistent in such matters.

Blass's law of the avoidance of a succession of short syllables as formulated in the *Attische Beredsamkeit* (3. Abt., 1. Absch., 2. Aufl., 1893, "Demosthenes," pp. 105-12) is, "Dass die Anhäufung von mehr als zwei kurzen Silben möglichst vermieden wird, wobei natürlich solche Silben, die durch Elision in Wegfall kommen, nicht mehr zählen." Blass defines the following classes of "apparent exceptions":

1. *Breves* caused by writing in one form a word which should be written in another form. Here belong words which should lose a short syllable by elision, or lengthen a final short syllable by the use of *ν* movable (before a word beginning with a consonant). Other words should be differently spelled, as *εἵνεκα* for *ἐνεκα*, *αὐτοῦ* for *ἐαυτοῦ*, *ἡβουλόμην* for *ἐβουλόμην*. Sometimes a slightly different form of the word is to be assumed, as *πότερ'* for *πότερον*, *πᾶς* for *ἅπας*.

2. *Breves* where the third short syllable comes before a pause (where we may always assume lengthening in delivery) or where a pause breaks the series.

<sup>1</sup> It is also true that Blass's Teubner text suffers from his attempts to secure rhythmical correspondences of *kola* according to a theory which he himself soon greatly modified.

3. *Breves* that are removed by crasis or aphaeresis.

4. *Breves* that are contained in a quotation, a citation, the address to the reading clerk, i.e., any matter that falls outside the speech proper.

The apparent exceptions under 1, 2, and 3 disappear in proper delivery. Much more important are Blass's "real exceptions":

1. A series of short syllables lying wholly within a word and not including its final syllable must be permitted if the word is to be used at all; many such words must be used. (The series should not include the final syllable, for a short final syllable may be lengthened by proper arrangement of words.) Blass further says (p. 108): "Ob dann zu dem hiermit gegebenen Tribrachys noch von den benachbarten Worten Kürzen hinzukommen, ist gleichgültig, falls nicht etwa damit noch eine zweite Hebung aufgelöst erscheint." This statement is not justified; the *breves* within the word cannot be avoided; the addition of other short syllables preceding it can be, for the most part.

2. *Breves* are permissible in a preposition and its noun, the two being almost like one word; the same is true of article and noun, and of article followed by preposition and noun.

3. *Breves* of which  $\delta\tau\iota$  is a part are permissible.

4. *Breves* are permissible in certain compact phrases, for the same reason as within a single word; so  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\tau\acute{\rho}\iota\tau\omicron\nu\ \xi\tau\omicron\varsigma$ .

5. *Breves* are permissible when two words are amalgamated by elision, or brought together in hiatus with shortening of the final syllable of the first word. Blass gives no grounds for this exception, and none can be given. Such grouping of short syllables is not necessary; when it does occur it is a real violation of the law.

In the following pages I give the instances of groups of three or more short syllables in the *De corona*, as a means of determining the extent of the permissible exceptions to the law of *breves*, and the extent and character of the violations of the law, after these exceptions have been eliminated. I have not recorded the *breves* occurring within a word unless they include its final syllable nor *breves* occurring at a pause that is marked by punctuation in Butcher's text, as neither group is significant for our purpose. We shall find that even a text prepared by an editor who recognized Demosthenes' tendency to

avoid *breves*, and who often used elision and punctuation with this in view, still contains a considerable number of passages with apparent *breves* that are to be removed by elision or punctuation.

The following abbreviations are used:

p. A pause to be assumed, whether marked by punctuation or not.

sp. Use different spelling or a variant form.

v. Use *v* movable.

e. Elide.

aph. Use aphaeresis.

cr. Use crasis.

ext. The *breves* are in matter that is external to the speech proper, as in quoted words, directions to the clerk, etc.

Gd., Goodwin's edition; Bl., Blass, Teubner text; H., Humphreys' text; F., Fuhr's Teubner text (1914).

"Bl." at the left of a reference in the column of real exceptions means that Blass in the *Attische Beredsamkeit*<sup>2</sup> (1893) recognizes this as a real violation of his "law." In all other cases "Bl." refers to Blass's Teubner text (1884). In his *Attische Beredsamkeit* Blass did not always follow the readings of his Teubner text, hence in the column of real exceptions some of the *breves* recorded as recognized by Blass as real violations of the law are cases that in his earlier (Teubner) text he had removed by one means or another.

### *De corona.* xviii

[The asterisk marks an instance that is not to be counted in reckoning the *minimum* number of *breves*. See p. 283.]

#### 1.1—13.10. First 100 Oxford Lines

Real Exceptions	Apparent Exceptions
*4. <i>περὶ ἐμαντοῦ</i>	2. cr. <i>τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ</i>
5. <i>πάντας ἂν ὁμολογήσαι</i> (vulg.; <i>πάντας</i> after <i>ὑμᾶς</i> S, L, Gd., H.)	3. p. <i>μὲν   ὅτι οὐ</i> (, Bl., H.)
	9. p. <i>δίκαιον ἅμα   βράχε'</i> (, Bl.)
*7. <i>περὶ ἀπάντων</i> (S, L, al.; <i>περὶ</i> <i>πάντων</i> vulg.)	10. e. <i>κοινὰ ὑπέρειν</i> (κοίν' Bl., H., F.)
9. <i>εὐθὺς ἂν ἀπελογούμενην</i>	10. cr. <i>χείρονα καὶ ἐμέ</i> (κάμ' Bl., H.)
*10. <i>περὶ ἐμοῦ</i>	
*13. <i>γράφοντα παράνομα</i>	

## 13.11—25.6. Second 100 Oxford Lines

## Real Exceptions

14. μέγαλ' ἔχουσαι  
 16. γὰρ ἀδικίας  
 17. καθ' ἐν ἑκαστον (vulg., Gd.,  
 H.; om. ἐν A<sup>1</sup>, al.; καθ' ἐν  
 ἑκαστ' S.; καθ' ἑκαστ' Bl.,  
 F.)  
 \*17. μετὰ Φιλοκράτους  
 Bl. 20. ἀμφοτέρα ταῦτ'  
 Bl. 23. οὗτος ὑγιὲς περὶ  
 25. πάντα συναγωνιζόμενος, (Syr.,  
 vulg.; τε τὴν εἰρήνην συν-  
 αγω— S, L<sup>1</sup>; om. πάντα  
 Bl., H., F.)

## Apparent Exceptions

19. p. πολέμου | οἱ τότε (, Bl., H.)  
 20. p. ὀργιζόμενοι | ἐτοίμως (, Bl.)  
 21. cr. ὁ ὑποκριτής  
 21. p. ἐπὶ ταῦτα | Φιλοκράτης  
 (, Bl., H.)  
 24. p. κατεψεύσατό μου | οὐδὲν  
 (, F.; om. μου Bl., H.)

## 25.7—41.2

26. ἡλπίσατε τὴν (om. τὴν B,  
 al., Bl., H.)  
 \*32. μὴ ἀπιμεν ἐκ Μακεδονίας  
 28. sp. ἀλλὰ τί ἐχρῆν (χρῆν Bl.)  
 31. sp. τοιοῦτον ἐγένετο· (τοιοῦτ' ?)  
 31. p. ἀεὶ | ὁμολογῶ  
 34. p. κεχρημένον | ἀνάγκη (, Bl.,  
 H.)  
 36. cr. καὶ ἔτι (κάτι Bl., H.)  
 40. ext. ὅτι "ἐγὼ ταῦτα . . ."  
 40. sp. ἐκείνον ὑφ' ἑαυτῷ (αὐτῷ  
 Bl., H.)

## 41.3—57.5

41. γὰρ ὅτι σὺ μὲν ἀλγείς (ὅτι,  
 σὺ Bl.)  
 Bl. 42. πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰς (εἰς τὰς V<sup>1</sup>, Bl.)  
 42. τί ἐγένετο;  
 43. ὃ τι ἂν ἐποιεῖτε  
 \*48. ὑπὸ Φιλίππῳ  
 Bl. 48. τί κακὸν οὐχὶ (κακῶν Bl.)  
 49. ὅτι ὁ μάλιστα  
 Bl. 49. δωροδοκῆσθε περιποιεῖ  
 ([δωρ-] Bl.)  
 49. πάλαι ἂν ἀπωλώλειτουργοι  
 57. ὃ τι ἂν δύνωμαι ἀγαθόν (vulg.,  
 Bl., F.; ὃ τι δύναμαι ἀγ-  
 S, L<sup>1</sup>, Gd., H.)

## 57.6—71.7

## Real Exceptions

- \*57. *περὶ ἐμοῦ*  
 \*59. *περὶ ἀπάντων* (πάντων A, V<sup>1</sup>,  
 al., Bl.)  
 63. *ταῦτα περιδεῖν*  
 66. *αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμ'*  
 68. *χωρὶς ἀδόξῃ*

## Apparent Exceptions

63. sp. *πότερον αὐτὴν* (πότερ' ?)  
 64. sp. *πόλιν ἐβούλετ'* (ἡβουλ- Bl.)  
 64. p. *γιγνόμενα* | *ἐπὶ τῇ* (, Bl.)  
 69. p. *ἀναγκαῖον ἅμα* | *πᾶσιν*  
 (, Bl.)  
 69. sp. *ἀλλὰ τί ἐχρῆν* (χρῆν Bl.,  
 H.)  
 70. e. *γέγονεν οἶδα* (γέγον' Bl., H.)

## 71.8—89.5

- \*75. *εἶτα Φιλοκράτης*  
 79. [*εἴ τι περὶ ἐμοῦ γέγραφεν*]  
 Bl. 81. *αὐτὸς ὁ Φίλιππος*  
 \*82. *περὶ ἐμοῦ*  
 \*87. *χάρακα βαλόμενος* (χαράκωμα  
 S<sub>yr</sub>. A: χαρακώματα L<sup>2</sup>, F.)

76. sp. *αἰτιαταὶ ἔμ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ* (μ'  
 Bl.)  
 82. p. *οὐδέποτε* | *ἐὰν* (, Bl., H., F.)  
 83. sp. *ἔμ' ἐπὶ τούτοις* (μ' Bl.)  
 89. p. *πόλεμος* | *ἀνευ* (, Bl., H.,  
 F.)

## 89.6—103.5

93. *Ἑλλήσποντον ὑπὸ Φιλίππῳ*  
 98. *κινδυνεύετε διαλογισάμενοι*  
 \*99. *ὑπὸ Θεμίσιωνος*  
 99. *τότε τριηράρχων* (S, L, H.;  
*τριηράρχων τότε vulg., Bl.*)  
 Bl. 102. *τοὺς δὲ μέτρ' ἦ*

93. cr. *προαίρεσις ἡ ἐμῇ*  
 97. sp. *καταφεύγοντας ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς*  
 (αὐτοὺς Bl.)  
 103. cr. *καὶ ἀπέφυγον*, (κάπ- Bl.)  
 100. e. *ἐπιστεύθητε ὑπολογισάμενοι*  
 (-θηθ' ὑπο- Bl., H., F.)  
 101. p. *τὴν πόλιν ὑπὲρ τῶν* (πόλιν,  
 Bl., H.)

## 103.6—119.3

- Bl. 107. *αὐτοῦ ἀπελείφθη*  
 Bl. 107. *δυναμένη ἀνάγεσθαι*  
 Bl. 108. *τὰδύνατα συνέβαινεν* ([συνεβ-]  
 Bl.)  
 Bl. 111. *βίον ὑπεύθυνος*  
*εἶναι ὁμολογῶ*  
 113. *ὅτι ἐπὶ τῷ*  
 113. *διὰ γε τοῦτο* (S, L, B, F, al.,  
 Gd., H., F. (τοῦτ'); δι' αὐτό  
 γε τοῦτο L<sup>2</sup>, A, vulg.; διὰ  
 τοῦτό γ' Bl.)  
 \*113. *περὶ ἐμοῦ*  
 Bl. 119. *ἃ μὲν ἐπέδωκα*  
 119. *τὰ διδόμεν' ὁμολογῶν* (διδό-  
 μενα ὁμολ- Bl.)

104. cr. *δὲ τοῦ ἐμοῦ νόμου*  
 105. ext. *ψήφισμα καθ' ὃ*  
 105. ext. *κατὰ τὸν ἐμόν*  
 109. cr. *πολιτεύμασι καὶ ἐν τοῖς*  
*(πολιτεύμασιν F.; [πολ-]*  
*Bl.)*  
 111. v. *ἔλεγε περὶ τῶν* (ἔλεγεν  
 Bl., H., F.)  
 111. sp. *αὐτὸς ἐδυνάμην* (ἡδυν- Bl.,  
 F.)  
 111. p. *ὁμολογῶ* | *ᾧν* (, Bl., H., F.)  
 118. ext. *μαρτυρεῖ ἐφ' οἷς*

## 119.4—132.4

## Real Exceptions

120. ὅπου ἂν ἀναρρηθῇ  
 \*125. πλέον ἢ ἔλαττον  
 128. λέγοντος ἐρυθριάσειε (ἡρυθ-  
 ρίασεν Bl.)  
 130. δηλονότι ταύτης

## Apparent Exceptions

120. p. λογίσασθαι | ὅτι (, Bl., H.,  
 F.)  
 121. ext. τινας ὁ δῆμος  
 123. p. εἰς ταῦτα | ἀπὸ (, Bl., H.;  
 ταυτ' F.)  
 124. aph. ἐχθρὸν ἢ ἐμὸν (ἢ 'μὸν)  
 127. ext. καὶ ἀρετή  
 127. ext. τὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ αἰσχροὶ δια-  
 γινώσκειται  
 130. e. ὧν ἔτυχεν ἦν (ἔτυχ' Bl.)  
 130. e. ἐποίησεν Ἀτρόμητον (ἐποί-  
 ησ' Bl.)

## 132.5—144.5

- Bl. 133. ἂν ὑπὸ τοῦ ([ἂν] Bl.)  
 Bl. 134. σύνδικον ὑπέρ  
 τοῦ ἱεροῦ  
 136. Φίλιππον ἐξήλεξα φανερώς  
 (ἐξήλεξα τὸν Φ. φανερώς  
 Hermog.; ἐξ. Φ. φανερώς  
 Bl.)  
 137. ὕστερον Ἀναξίνῳ  
 137. τῷ ὑπὸ τῶν  
 138. ἂν ἐγὼ ἔτι (ἐγὼ νῦν ἔτι vulg.,  
 Bl.)  
 \*139. ἐμῷ ὕδατι

134. p. Δήλῳ | ἀπὸ τῆς (, Bl., H.,  
 F.)  
 135. ext. καὶ ὅτι  
 137. ext. καὶ ὅτι  
 143. ext. πόλεμον εἰς  
 143. ext. πόλεμον Ἀμφικτυονικόν

## 144.6—161.4

151. κατηκόντισαν ἅπαντας (S  
 corr., pr. L, A; ἅπαντ. κατ.  
 F., vulg.: om. ἅπαντας S<sup>1</sup>,  
 Bl.)  
 160. μάλιστα δ' ὅτι (δέ, ὅτι Bl.)  
 161. παρ' ἐκατέροις

147. v.(p.) Ἀμφικτύοσι | καὶ (-σιν  
 Bl., F.)  
 160. p. ἀψαμένῳ | εἰς (, Bl. H., F.)

## 161.5—177.9

161. γένοιτο παρατηρῶν (S, L<sup>1</sup>,  
 Gd., H.; γενήσεται παρατ.  
 A, vulg., Bl.)  
 Bl. 162. πρότερον ἢ (προτέρων Bl.)  
 163. ὅτι τὸν ἐν Ἀμφίσσῃ

162. aph. μᾶλλον ἢ ἐμοῦ (μοῦ Bl.)  
 169. cr. ἅμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ  
 170. ext. τίς ἀγορεύειν  
 174. e. ἐτύγγανεν ἔχον, (ἐτύγγαν'  
 Bl.)



## Real Exceptions

- Bl. 168. *θόρυβον ἴστε*  
*ἴστε μὲν ἅπαντες (θόρυβον,*  
*ἴστε μὲν πάντες Bl.)*  
 171. *ἀναστάντες ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμ*  
 Bl. 171. *ἀμφότερα ταῦτα*  
 \*172. *ἔπραττεν ὁ Φίλιππος*  
*(ἔπραττε Bl.)*  
 Bl. 173. *οὗτος ἐν ἐκείνῃ*  
*τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγὼ (οὗτος τηνικαὐτ'*  
*ἐγὼ Bl.)*  
 173. *ὅτι μόνος τῶν*  
 174. *ἠκούομεν ἐν Ἑλατεία*  
 174. *μέντοι ἵν' ἔτοιμα*  
 Bl. 177. *εἶτα μεταθέσθαι*

## Apparent Exceptions

174. p. *ἔχει' | ἔφην*  
 175. p. *τὰ ὄπλα | τοὺς (, Bl., H.)*  
 177. p. *ὑμέτερα | ἐξ (, Bl.; ὑμέτερ'*  
*ἐξ, F.)*  
 177. p. *πατρίδα | πάρεσθ' (, Bl.)*

## 177.10—196.3

- Bl. 177. *βοηθήσουσα δύναμις ἐν Ἑλα-*  
*τεία*  
 178. *τῷ πράγματι παραινῶ ([τῷ*  
*πραγ.] Bl.)*  
 178. *προσέχετε τὸν νοῦν (προσ-*  
*έσχετε S<sup>1</sup>; πρόσσχετε Bl.)*  
 180. *ὅσα προσῆκε (ἃ προς. A, al.,*  
*Bl.)*  
*τὸν ἀγαθὸν πολίτην*  
 179. ext. *ψήφισμα τὸ τότε γενόμενον*  
 180. p. *Κρέοντα | ἣ ὃν ἐν Κολυττῷ*  
*(, Bl., H.; Κρέοντ' F.)*  
 191. ext. *τίς ἀγορεύειν*  
 192. sp. *τὰ μὲν ἔμελλεν (ἤμελλ' Bl.;*  
*ἤμελλεν S, H., F.)*  
 193. cr. *καὶ ἐπιμελῶς (κάπι- Bl.)*  
 196. cr. *καὶ ἀκρωμένους (κάκρο-*  
*Bl.)*

## 196.4—208.10

- Bl. 197. *ὅσον ἐγὼ*  
 \*Bl. 202. *πρότερον ἰσχυρῶν (προτέρων*  
*ἰσ, Bl.)*  
 203. *αἰῶνα διατετέλεκε*  
 \*Bl. 204. *ἂν ἀγάσαιτο (ἂν ἀγασθείη*  
*Cobet, Bl.)*  
 204. *στρατηγὸν ἐλόμενοι*  
 205. *ὅτι ὁ μὲν τοῖς*  
 197. p. *ὀκνήσας ἴδιον | οὐδ' (, Bl. H.)*  
 197. cr., e. *καὶ ἅμα Ἀρίστρατος (ἅμ'*  
*Bl., H., F.)*  
 Bl. 201. p. *πρὸς Διὸς | ἐωρῶμεν*  
 201. e. *ἀγῶνα ἕτεροι (ἀγῶν' F.)*  
 203. e. *πάτρια οὐδ' (πάτρι' Bl., H.,*  
*F.)*  
 205. p. *δουλείουσαν | ἀποθνήσκειν*  
*(, Bl.)*

## 208.11—219.3

- \*209. *ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμ' ([ | Bl.)*  
 211. *ὀπόθεν ἐνταῦθ' (S, L; ὅθεν εἰς*  
*ταῦτα cett.; ἐπάνειμ' οὖν ὅθεν*  
*ἐξέβην Bl.)*  
 213. *διὰ τὸ τὴν*  
 213. *ὑπεπόνθησαν ὑπὸ Φιλίππου*  
 213. *καὶ ἀνδράποδα καὶ*  
 209. p. *παριόντα | τὸ τίνος φρόνημα*  
*(, Bl., H., F.)*  
 210. p., e. *συμβόλαια ἐπὶ τῶν (συμβό-*  
*λαι' H., F.); συμβόλαια,*  
*ἐπὶ Bl.)*  
 213. cr. *βοσκήματα καὶ ἀνδράποδα*  
*([καὶ ἀνδρ. καὶ . . . ] Bl.)*

Real Exceptions

213. διαρπασθησόμεν' ὑπὸ τοῦ  
([ὑπὸ τοῦ] Bl.)  
215. τρί' ἐν ἐκείνῃ  
Bl. 219. Καλλίστρατος ἐκείνος

Apparent Exceptions

216. p. στρατοπέδου | οὐδέεις (, F., Bl.)

219.4—234.7

221. ὑπὲρ ἔμαντοῦ  
223. τὸν Ὑπερείδην  
227. καθαραὶ ὥσιν (L, vulg.; καθαίρωνσιν S', Bl., Gd., H., F.)  
228. περὶ ἑκατέρου  
\*229. μετὰ Φιλίππου  
Bl. 230. πόλεμον εἶναι  
Bl. 230. στάδι' ἀπὸ τῆς  
231. περιβαλλόμενος ἐπλάττετο  
(περιβαλλ. πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπλ. vulg., Dionys. Hal., *Thucyd.* 54).  
232. ὅτι ὁ τὸν ῥήτορα  
\*234. οὔτε Ῥόδος οὔτε

219. p. ἑαντῶ | ἄμα (, Bl.)  
222. cr. Φίλιππον ἢ ἐμῇ  
222. ext. ψηφίσματα τὰ ἀποπεφευγότα  
223. e. γέγραφεν οὕτως (γέγραφε' Bl., H.)  
230. cr. ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐν  
231. e. προστίθηναι ὅτι τῆς (προστίθηναι' Bl., H.)

234.8—248.5

238. διπλάσια τῶν  
239. εἴπερ ἐνεδέχετο παρὰ τοὺς  
(ἐνεδεχ. perhaps gloss from ἐνῆν Weil.)  
\*244. παρὰ Φιλίππου  
244. οὐδὲ παρὰ τῶν (οὐδὲ S, L, Gd.: οὐ cett., Bl., H.)  
245. τε μαλακίαν  
\*247. τὸ κατ' ἐμέ.  
\*248. περὶ ἐμοῦ  
248. καὶ ἑορακῶς (ἑωρακῶς codd., Bl.)

236. cr., p. μισθαρνοῦσι καὶ ἐμοί (-σιν F.)  
241. ext. θάλαττα ὑπὸ τῶν  
243. ext. ἂν ἀπέθανεν  
246. p. ἀρχόμενα | καὶ (, Bl.)  
246. cr. καὶ ἔτι τὰς

248.6—260.5

252. ἀνθρωπινώτερον ἐγὼ  
Bl. 258. τινὶ κέχρησαι  
259. δὲ γενόμενος τῇ

249. p. μανία | οὔτ' (, Bl.)  
249. p. ἐστι | καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν  
252. p. οἰόμενος | οὐκ οἶδεν (, Bl.)  
252. p., e. θεωρήσατε | ὅσῳ (, Bl., F.; -σαθ' H.)  
254. cr. τὸ ἐπίβαλλον  
257. cr. ὥστε καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς  
259. cr. καὶ ἀπομάττων (κάπο- Bl., H.)

## 260.6—276.1

## Real Exceptions

267. πάντες ἀπολέσειαν

269. εὐθὺς ἐπιλελῆσθαι

## Apparent Exceptions

266. p. τήμερον | ἐγὼ (, Bl.)

269. v. ἔστι τῷ ὀνειδίξειν (ἔστιν Bl., F.)

273. e. γὰρ ἐπὶ εὐνοία (ἐπ' Bl., H., F.)

273. p. δηλονότι | καὶ

## 276.2—288.11

284. ταῦτα μετατιθέμενος τὰ

288. οἱ ὑπὸ τοῦ (S, L, Gd., H.; [ ] Bl.)

Bl. 288. αἰρεθέντες ἐπὶ τὰς ([ἐπὶ τὰς . . . ] Bl.)

288. τὸ περίδειπνον

276. aph. μᾶλλον ἢ ἐμοὶ (ῥμοι Bl., H.)

278. cr. καὶ ἀγαθοῦ

279. p. ἀνηλωκεῖν | ιδίας (, Bl.)

282. p. ῥήτορος | ἢ εἰ (, Bl.)

284. cr. τὰ δνόματα

288. p. ἀδελφοὶ | οἱ ὑπὸ (, F.; [οἱ . . . ] Bl.)

## 288.12—302.1

288. μάλιστα διέφερεν,

\*288. ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων (πάντων Bl., H.)

291. ᾤετο μὲν ἐμοῦ ([ἐμοῦ] Bl.)

293. ἐπεὶ ἔμοιγ'

297. μὲν ὑπὸ Φιλίππου ([ ] Bl., Butch. after Dobree)

298. ἐπὶ τὸ λῆμμα

288. ext. τὸ ἐπίγραμμα

291. p. ἑαυτοῦ | ὅτι τοῖς (, Bl., F.)

296. p. πατρῴων | ὦνπερ (, Bl., F.)

298. p. μέγεθος | οὐτ' (, Bl.)

298. p. οὐτε φόβος | οὐτ' (, Bl.)

298. p. προηγάγετο | ὦν (, Bl., H., F.)

298. p. πατρίδι | οὐδὲν (, Bl., H., F.)

298. cr. καὶ ἀδιαφθόρου (κάδι- Bl., H.)

## 302.2—316.6

Bl. 303. οὐδὲ προεθένθ' (προεθέντα S, A, Y; προδοθέντα vulg.; πραθέντα Dobree; πραθένθ' Bl.)

Bl. 307. δέ τις ἰδίᾳ

Bl. 312. εἶχες ἔρανον

Bl. 316. τῶν πρότερον εὐεργεσίας (S, L, al.; προτέρων vulg., Bl.)

303. p. κακία | ἢ (, Bl., H.)

305. ext. τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν

305. ext., cr. κατὰ τὰ ἐμὰ ψηφίσματα (τὰμὰ Bl., H.)

310. e. ἔδωκεν ὁ παρελθὼν (ἔδωχ' Bl., H.)

## 316.7—324.6. 58 Lines

Real Exceptions	Apparent Exceptions
317. γὰρ ὅτι καὶ [Bl. 317. τοὺς [δὲ] πρότερον γεγεν-]	321. p. λέγοντι   ἀνεπιφθονώτατον (, Bl.)
320. ἐξέτασις ἦν (om. ἦν S, L, Bl., Gd., H., F.)	323. p. ἐπαινοῦσι   καὶ ὅπως (-ουσιν Bl.)
*321. περὶ ἐμαντοῦ	

By the list above we find, in the 2,258 Oxford lines of the *De corona*, 137 real exceptions to the law of the avoidance of three or more successive short syllables, and 106 apparent exceptions, after eliminating 20 instances of *breves* in extraneous matter.

## I. THE APPARENT EXCEPTIONS

Of the apparent exceptions, 53 (just half) are removed by recognizing natural pauses in delivery. Most of these pauses might well be marked in our texts by the comma, as Blass has done in his Teubner text. Humphreys does not go as far as Blass in the use of the comma, but he recognizes the propriety of using it in many cases where Butcher does not; in this respect his text is the better of the two. Goodwin, apparently giving little attention to Demosthenic usage as to rhythm and hiatus, marks the pause in only one of these passages (*παριόντα, τὸ τίνος φρόνημα* § 209), although his failure to do so not only leaves the misleading groups of *breves*, but such harsh hiatus as *κεκρημένου ἀνάγκη* § 34; *ὁμολογῶ ὦν* § 111; *λογίσασθαι ὅτι* § 120; *Δήλῳ ἀπὸ* § 134; *ἀψαμένῳ εἰς* § 160. We must not, of course, assume that every pause that would be sufficient in delivery to prevent a succession of *breves* is to be marked by punctuation in our texts; we are dealing here with rhetorical considerations; the printed punctuation takes account both of rhetorical and of grammatical demands. We should hardly punctuate in such expressions as the following, although there is a clear rhetorical pause: *ὀργιζόμενοι* | *ἐτοίμως* (*brr.* and hiatus) § 20; *ἀεὶ* | *ὁμολογῶ* (*brr.* and hiatus) § 31; *ἀδελφοὶ* | *οἱ ὑπὸ* (*brr.* and hiatus) § 288.

The assumption of the use of crasis removes 23 more of the apparent exceptions. We have no means of proving how far an orator used crasis in delivery, but we must assume that it was used frequently.

We are certainly to assume the free use of elision also in delivery, as Butcher does in his printing as a rule; yet even in his text 15 cases of *breves* appear where elision should be recognized in the printed text. Humphreys prints 9 of these with elision, Fuhr, 7 of them. Goodwin's text seems to have been prepared with no reference to the effect of elision on *breves*; in the first 200 (Oxford) lines of the speech, Goodwin's text shows 11 cases of *breves* that would be removed by elision,<sup>1</sup> and are so treated by Humphreys, and by Butcher with one exception (*κοινὰ ὑπέρευ* § 10). Of course all these are cases of apparent hiatus also, therefore doubly offensive. The fact that Goodwin does use elision freely in his printed text makes his failure to use it in cases like these the more misleading.

## II. THE REAL EXCEPTIONS

The 137 real exceptions, an average of 6 to the hundred Oxford lines,<sup>2</sup> form the evidence on which we must base the attempt to determine the range of the "law" or tendency of Demosthenes' avoidance of *breves* in the *De corona*. It may be, however, that we ought to reduce this list of 137 real exceptions, for included among them are some cases of *breves* that are not entirely certain, and others that are practically unavoidable, and therefore perhaps to be treated like *breves* within a word.

1. In 5 cases there is some question of the pronunciation: in § 4 and § 321 *περὶ ἐμαντοῦ* may have been pronounced *περὶ 'μαντοῦ*; in § 32 *μὴ ἄπιμεν* may have been pronounced as though written *μῆπιμεν*; in § 125 *ἢ ἔλαττον* may have been treated in a similar way; in § 172, while we should hardly print *ἔπραθ'* ὁ, that may have been the pronunciation (Blass, *Rede vom Kranze*, p. xiv).

2. In some cases we may be justified in assuming a form of the word that is slightly different from that of the manuscripts. So *μου* for the unemphatic *ἐμοῦ* in *περὶ ἐμοῦ* §§ 10, 57, 82, 113, 248. In §§ 7 and 59 *περὶ ἀπάντων* may have been *περὶ πάντων*; so also *ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων* § 288. For *πρότερον* § 202, Blass would write *προτέρων*; for *ἀγασσaiτο* § 204, he accepts Cobet's emendation, *ἀγασθείη*.

<sup>1</sup> *πεπραγμένα ἐμαντῶ* § 4; *τε ἰδίου* § 8; *κοινὰ ὑπέρευ* § 10; *ἐνδέδειχθε ἐπὶ* § 10; *μεγάλα ἔχουσαι* § 14; *πράγματα ἐλέγχους* § 15; *ὅσα ὑπὲρ* § 17; *ἐγωγε ἐπολιτευόμεν* § 18; *ὥστε ἀνελεῖν* § 18; *χρήματα ἀναλίσκων* § 19; *δήποτε ἐνεκα* § 21.

<sup>2</sup> In the following discussion I shall occasionally use the term "per cent" to indicate the number of groups of *breves* per hundred lines.

3. The *breves* in the following fixed phrases are unavoidable: γράφοντα παράνομα § 13; χάρακα βαλόμενος § 87; τῷ ἐμῷ ὕδατι § 139; ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμ' § 209; τὸ κατ' ἐμέ § 247.

In some cases, though by no means in all, the *breves* that lie in part in proper names are practically unavoidable. Such cases are: μετὰ Φιλοκράτους § 17; ὑπὸ Φιλίππῳ § 48; εἶτα Φιλοκράτης § 75; ὑπὸ Θεμισσωνος § 99; μετὰ Φιλίππου § 229; οὔτε Ῥόδος § 234 (possibly also a pause after Ῥόδος); παρὰ Φιλίππου § 244.

If we deduct the 27 *breves* of these three groups (marked by an asterisk in column 1), 110 *breves* remain in the 2,258 lines, an average of 4.9 per hundred. This may be taken as the minimum average for the *De corona*. But in comparing this speech with others it is generally better to use the maximum figure, 6; for something of the subjective element enters in, the moment one begins to reduce the number on the ground of possible change of pronunciation or of the supposed necessity of the use of set phrases, etc. In comparing large blocks the relative frequency of *breves* will be about the same, whether we reckon the maximum or the minimum number in each block that is involved in the comparison. In dealing with a short block, like one of the *Philippics*, the repeated use of some one set phrase or some one proper name may considerably affect the result; here it is safer to use both minimum and maximum figures. Wherever in the following discussion minimum figures are given, they are obtained by excluding groups that correspond to those analyzed above for the *De corona*.

Our results are affected, of course, by some questionable manuscript readings. Such variants in the *De corona* are recorded in our analysis. The only safe course here for our investigation is to use the reading that is best on grounds other than those of rhythm. How far, after the facts of rhythm have been established, these facts themselves may be used in deciding between variant readings in any given case should become clear as our investigation proceeds. The fact that there is some uncertainty of manuscript readings of course makes our conclusions to that extent doubtful, but the number of such cases is so small in comparison with the mass of material included in our study that the results are not seriously affected.

Our next step is to determine to what extent Demosthenes was indifferent to the occurrence of *breves* in groups caused by the lighter words, like the prepositions, the articles, the particles, etc.

The article enters into only 19 such groups (including 5 where it follows a preposition of two short syllables, and 2 where it precedes one).<sup>1</sup> In 3 of these the article stands with a proper name, and in 4 it is in a set phrase (ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα §§ 60, 171, 209; τὸ κατ' ἐμέ § 247). Considering the frequency of the article, the fact that it occurs so seldom in *breves* warrants the conclusion that its occurrence was objectionable to the ear of Demosthenes. Blass implies that the orator allowed himself a much greater freedom than we find in this examination. He says (p. 108): "Ferner gilt bei ihm wie bei den Tragikern die Verbindung einer Präposition mit einem Nomen einem Worte gleich, und bei dem Redner auch die Verbindung eines Artikels mit dem Nomen, oder mit Präposition und Nomen, während die Dichter bei ihrer Freiheit in der Auslassung des Artikels in diesen Zwang nicht kamen." This statement is to be modified by Blass's qualifying words, "Jedoch was an und für sich erlaubt ist, würde fehlerhaft werden, wenn es zu häufig käme." Blass's suggestion that when Demosthenes does allow the article in *breves* it is from the feeling that article and noun are practically one word is misleading. *Breves* that occur within a word must be allowed, or the word cannot be used at all; but *breves* caused by an article followed by its noun or an attributive modifier of the noun can usually be avoided, as we see by the fact that only 12 such groups of *breves* occur in the *De corona*, three of which are with proper names, and three in the set phrase ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα.

The same criticism applies to Blass's statement as to *breves* formed by a preposition and its object. Demosthenes' use of such groups is very restricted. There are 10 instances of *περί* in *breves* in the *De corona*, but they are all in the phrases *περί ἐμοῦ* (5 times, perhaps to be read *περί μου*, see p. 282), *περί πάντων* (twice, perhaps to be read *περί πάντων*), *περί ἐμαυτοῦ* (twice, perhaps to be pronounced *περί 'μαυτοῦ*), and *περί ἐκατέρου* (once).<sup>2</sup> The 10 instances of *περί* in

<sup>1</sup> Cases where the article is subject to crasis are included in the "apparent exceptions."

<sup>2</sup> I do not count *περί ἐμοῦ* in § 79, bracketed by Blass and Butcher.

*breves* form not quite 12 per cent of all the instances of *περί* in the speech; but in Aeschines *Vs. Ctesiphon* 34 per cent of the occurrences of *περί* are in *breves*, and in Lysias *Vs. Eratosthenes*, 42 per cent. From this it is clear that Demosthenes distinctly restricts himself.

ὑπό is in *breves* 9 times; two of these cases show the preposition followed by a proper name; three others have ὑπό Φιλίππου or Φιλίππῳ preceded by one or more short syllables; in the 4 remaining cases the *breves* are made by ὑπό with preceding syllables, not with its own object, and do not therefore fall under Blass's principle of treating preposition and object as essentially one word. The 7 cases of ὑπό in *breves* (excluding the 2 with proper names only) form 15½ per cent of the occurrences of ὑπό in the speech, as against 32 per cent in Aeschines *Vs. Ctesiphon*, and 43 per cent in Lysias *Vs. Eratosthenes*. Demosthenes therefore shows a clear tendency to avoid *breves* with ὑπό.

There are 7 cases of ἐπί in *breves*, but 3 of these are in the fixed phrase ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα. In 3 of the 4 remaining cases the *breves* are formed by ἐπί with the preceding word, not with its object. In the 4 cases of παρά in *breves* one is with a proper name, and two are with the preceding word. Two of the 3 cases of ὑπέρ in *breves* have the *breves* in the preposition and its object. Of the 2 cases of κατά in *breves* (both in set phrases) one has the *breves* wholly in the preposition and its object. The 2 cases of μετά in *breves* are with proper names. The only instances of διά in *breves* (out of 44 occurrences of διά in the speech) are in the phrases διά γε τοῦτο (§ 113) and διὰ τὸ . . . ἔχειν (§ 213). We find ἐν in the speech 162 times, but only 5 times in *breves*; in no one of these groups are the *breves* wholly in the preposition and its object. In the single instance of ἀπό in *breves* (out of 22 occurrences of the word) the group is made by the preposition with the preceding word (§ 230).

We must conclude that Demosthenes generally avoided groups of short syllables with prepositions. In case of prepositions with proper names or fixed phrases the use was unavoidable. In other cases the *breves* are as likely to be due to the word before the preposition as to its object. All instances of *breves* with prepositions, except with proper names or in fixed phrases, must be included in reckoning the minimum number of *breves*.



Blass treats  $\delta\tau\iota$  as an exception to the law of *breves*, but it does not occur in *breves* in the *De corona* often enough to justify his position. The 9 instances are only 15 per cent of all the occurrences of  $\delta\tau\iota$  in the speech, as against 47 per cent in Aeschines *Vs. Ctesiphon*, and 45 per cent in Lysias *Vs. Eratosthenes*.

$\acute{\mu}\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  occurs in *breves* 5 times,  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  3 times, and  $\alpha\grave{\nu}$  8 times.

While our analysis of these instances shows that Demosthenes did not admit the article, the prepositions, and the lighter particles freely in *breves*, yet the fact that the groups containing these words make up about 60 per cent of all the *breves* of the speech, shows that he did admit them much more freely than he did the more substantial words, viz., verbs, substantives, adjectives, demonstratives, etc.

The bearing of these facts on textual criticism is evident. *Breves* contained in the lighter words of the sentence, while restricted, are nevertheless not so rare as to warrant textual alteration in any given case, or to have much weight in the decision between variant readings. But *breves* in groups of the stronger words, or at the end of one of them, are rare enough to warrant giving considerable weight where good manuscripts differ; they are not rare enough to warrant textual alteration on the ground of the *breves* alone.

In any attempt to determine the frequency of exceptions to the "law" of the avoidance of *breves*, the groups with the article, prepositions, and the other lighter words must be included with the groups involving the stronger words; neither sort of *breves* is freely admitted, neither one is entirely excluded; the question is one of relative frequency, and for that no precise statement can be made. If we include all real *breves* in our discussion, we have a safe criterion for the comparison of different parts of the same speech with one another, and for the comparison of one speech as a whole with another speech.

An examination of the several divisions of the speech shows a marked tendency to avoid *breves* as the thought becomes more impressive and the style more elevated; yet this is not without exceptions.

In the proem the *breves* are considerably less than the average of the speech, 3 cases in 58 lines (5 per cent); two of these are of the least objectionable type,  $\pi\epsilon\tau\iota$   $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon$  § 4,  $\pi\epsilon\tau\iota$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$  § 7 (see p. 282).

The fine discussion of the situation at the time of the making of the peace, §§ 18–25, 66 lines, has 2 cases (3 per cent):  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$   $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau'$  § 20, and  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\upsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\epsilon\varsigma$  § 23.

The narrative and discussion of the acts following the conclusion of the peace (§§ 25–50) show only 3 cases of *breves* in the first 105 lines (§§ 25–41): *πάντα συναγωνιζόμενος* § 25 (a very doubtful reading), *ἡλπίσατε τήν* § 26 (another very doubtful reading), and *μὴ ἀπιμεν* § 32 (see p. 282). But as the argument and attack proceed we find 4 cases in 24 lines (§§ 41–44); then after 29 forcible lines that are entirely clear we are surprised to find 5 cases in only 15 lines (§§ 48 f.), and that in a passage of deep feeling and fine rhetorical finish. The section as a whole, 173 lines, with 12 *breves*, has a rate of 7 to the hundred lines, a rate slightly greater than that of the speech as a whole.

The eloquent discussion of Demosthenes' services up to the campaign at Byzantium (§§ 60–87, 160 lines) shows only 6 cases, and most of these of a minor sort. The discussion of the rescue of Byzantium (§§ 87–102) has 5 cases in only 106 lines, but only one of these (*κινδυνεύετε διαλογισάμενοι* § 98) is in the more elevated part.

The discussion of the naval reforms, a part perhaps the least impressive in the speech (§§ 102–10), has 4 *breves* in 53 lines (a high rate), including 2 bad cases of hiatus. The answer to the technical charges under the laws, another of the less elevated sections, has a like rate, 9 *breves* in the 109 lines (§§ 110–26).

The solemn and elevated passage in which Demosthenes accuses Aeschines of having been the guilty cause of the Amphissian war (§§ 140–60, 129 lines) has only one group of *breves* and that of doubtful manuscript authority. The transition passage that follows (§§ 160–69) has 7 cases in only 37 lines, a very high rate. The story of the news from Elateia, a famous masterpiece of narrative, has no *breves* in the strictly descriptive part (§§ 168–71), but as narrative gives place to argument the *breves* become comparatively numerous. The 87 lines (§§ 171–81) show 14 cases, a rate of 16 to the hundred, a surprisingly high rate.

The elevated passage in which Demosthenes discusses his services in the crisis (§§ 188–213, 201 lines) is in its earlier part almost wholly free from *breves*, having but 2 cases in the first 123 lines, *ὅσον ἐγώ* § 197 and *πρότερον ἰσχυρῶν* § 202; but after this they become more frequent—6 cases in 78 lines. The "Marathonian oath," however (§§ 206–8 incl.), is entirely free from them.

The effective passage (§§ 227–52) in which Demosthenes reviews his career in the form of the *λογισμός* suggested by Aeschines shows more *breves* than the average, 16 cases in 189 lines, nearly  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The long discussion of *Τύχη* (§§ 252–76), where we might expect more freedom of style, has remarkably few *breves*, only 5 in 166 lines, 3 to the hundred—only half the average of the speech.

In the indignant passage (§§ 276–85) in which Demosthenes takes up Aeschines' caution to the jury to beware of Demosthenes as a crafty rhetorician, there is only one group of *breves* (*ταῦτα μετατιθέμενος* § 284) in the 69 lines. The outburst against the charge of Philippizing (§§ 294–301) has only 2 *breves* in the 61 lines, *μὲν ὑπὸ Φιλίππου* § 297, bracketed by Butcher after Dobree, and *ἐπὶ τὸ λῆμμα* § 298.

The closing paragraphs, §§ 301 ff., have 7 *breves* in 165 lines, a rate somewhat less than that of the speech as a whole.

If, with Schäfer and Blass, we consider the epilogue as beginning with § 252, the epilogue as a whole has 22 *breves* in 525 lines, about 4.2 to the hundred, a rate considerably less than that of the speech as a whole.

Having determined with a reasonable degree of precision the extent of Demosthenes' avoidance of *breves* in a speech that was presumably prepared with the greatest care, and that represents his matured art, I proceed to an examination of the whole Demosthenic corpus. We may hope to learn whether there was any advance in Demosthenes' style in this particular between his earlier and his later works; whether in the private speeches, written for other men, he used as much care in this matter as in the case of speeches for public suits or for the bema; and whether the rate of *breves* in any speech attributed to Demosthenes may safely be used as a criterion of genuineness.

I have recorded only the real exceptions; in determining these, I have followed steadily the same principles as in the preceding investigation. It is not likely that any two investigators would always agree as to which class of exceptions are real, and which only apparent; but if each follows his own principles consistently throughout the whole corpus, the results will not differ materially. A tendency, e.g., on the part of one to assume less freedom in the use of crasis would give a higher total of *breves* for any one speech, but would not materially alter the ratio of *breves* between one speech and

another, or between the speeches of Demosthenes and those of another writer—and this ratio is the essential point of our study.

For speeches i to xxvii, inclusive, I have used Butcher's Oxford text; for the rest, the text of Baiter and Sauppe, Zurich, 1838. The Zurich text follows S closely, and is not influenced by rhythmical theories of the editors; its lines have been reduced to the Oxford standard of length.

I have added a study of *breves* in selected parts of other prose writers; such comparison is necessary for any just estimate of the significance of the results of the study of Demosthenes. It is here to be remarked that the tendency of any writer to avoid hiatus within the *kolon* will of itself reduce the number of accidental *breves*, for in writers who admit hiatus freely a group of short syllables is often due in part to the shortening of a long vowel in hiatus. In all the authors studied the lines have been reduced to the Oxford standard of length. In Aeschines the numerous phrases that were bracketed by Blass have been treated as belonging to the text.

It will be found that in the passages from other authors the *breves* are distributed fairly evenly throughout the passage; the number in any one block of 100 lines does not vary greatly from that in any other; in the part of Isocrates examined the range is from 35 to 43; in Aeschines it is from 32 to 49; whereas in Demosthenes they are distributed unevenly, the *breves* in the *De corona* reckoned by successive hundred lines being 6, 7, 2, 10, 5, 4, 6, 10, 4, 8, 3, 14, 5, 6, 7, 10, 8, 3, 2, 4, 6, 4. An even distribution indicates accidental occurrence, uneven distribution suggests conscious avoidance, now more careful, now less.

## BREVES IN THE DEMOSTHENIC CORPUS

### REAL EXCEPTIONS

#### Rate per Hundred Lines

[Titles in parentheses are of speeches regarded by Blass as not genuine, or of doubtful genuineness. Figures in parentheses, after the number of *breves* in certain speeches, give the minimum number of *breves*, reckoned as explained on p. 283.]

#### OF THE FIRST PERIOD

##### Pleas in Private Cases

(Vs. Callippus. lii.) 369–368 B.C.

brr. 55.3

(Vs. Nicostratus. liii.) 366–365 B.C.

brr. 60.6

[The above-named are too early to be genuine.]

First vs. Aphobus. xxvii.	363 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 44.8
Second vs. Aphobus. xxviii.	363 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 43.2
Vs. Aphobus for Phanus. xxix.	363-362 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 20.9
First vs. Onetor. xxx.	362-361 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 36
Second vs. Onetor. xxxi.	362-361 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 23
(Vs. Timotheus. xlix.)	362 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 60.5
(Vs. Polycles. l.)	<i>ca.</i> 358 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 57

## OF THE SECOND PERIOD

## Political Speeches and Pleas in Public Cases

On the Trierarchical Crown. li.	359-358 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 2.4
Vs. Androton. xxii.	355 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 5.2
Vs. Leptines. xx.	354 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 7.3
On the Symmories. xiv.	354 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 9.6 (8.3)
Περὶ Συμράξεως. xiii.	354-351(?) B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 11
Vs. Timocrates. xxiv.	353-352 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 6.8; 37.5
For the Megalopolitans. xvi.	353 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 8.4 (7.5)
Vs. Aristocrates. xxiii.	352 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 7.1
First Philippic. iv.	351 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 6.1 (3.4)
For the Rhodians. xv.	351-350 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 5 (4.2)
First Olynthiac. i.	349 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 2.8 (2.8)
Second Olynthiac. ii.	349 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 2.5 (2.1)
Third Olynthiac. iii.	349 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 7 (4.8)
Vs. Midias. xxi.	348-347 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 6.8

## Pleas in Private Cases

Vs. Conon. liv.	<i>ca.</i> 356-355 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 16.5
(Vs. Euergus and Mnesibulus. xlvii.)	353-352 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 49.3
For Phormion. xxxvi.	350-349 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 15.6
First vs. Stephanus. xlv.	349-348 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 9.1
(Second vs. Stephanus. xlvi.)	349-348 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 39
First vs. Boeotus. xxxix.	348 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 17.2
(Second vs. Boeotus. xl.)	347 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 49.8

## OF THE THIRD PERIOD

## Political Speeches and Pleas in Public Cases

On the Peace. v.	346 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 4.5 (3.4)
Second Philippic. vi.	344 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 6 (3.8)
On the Embassy. xix.	343 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 7.5 (5.5)
On the Chersonese. viii.	341 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 4.3 (3.5)
Third Philippic. ix.	341 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 9.4 (7)
Fourth Philippic. x.	341-340 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 6.9
(Vs. Philip's Letter. xi.)	340-339 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 33

On the Crown. xviii. 330 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 6 (4.9)
First vs. Aristogiton. xxv. ca. 325 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 9
(Second vs. Aristogiton. xxvi.) ca. 325 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 36

## Pleas in Private Cases

Vs. Pantaenetus. xxxvii. ca. 346-345 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 10
Vs. Nausimachus. xxxviii. ca. 346-345 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 8.3
Vs. Eubulides. lvii. 345 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 32
(Vs. Theocritus. lviii.) 344-339 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 37.6
(Vs. Neaera. lix.) 343-340 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 44.9
(Vs. Macartatus. xliii.) ca. 342 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 56.8
(Vs. Olympiodorus. xlviii.) ca. 341 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 60.4
(Vs. Lacritus. xxxv.) 342-341 (?) B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 54.5
(Vs. Phormion. xxxiv.) 327-326 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 49.1
(Vs. Apaturius. xxxiii.) After 341 B.C., perhaps of the time of Alexander	<i>brr.</i> 49.8

## OF THE PERIOD OF ALEXANDER

## Pleas in Private Cases

(Vs. Phaenippus. xlii.)	<i>brr.</i> 42.3
(Vs. Zenothemis. xxxii.)	<i>brr.</i> 16.3
(Vs. Dionysodorus. lvi.) 323-322 B.C.	<i>brr.</i> 55.4

## OF UNDETERMINED DATE

## Pleas in Private Cases and Epideictic Speeches

Vs. Spudias. xli.	<i>brr.</i> 49.5
Vs. Callicles. lv.	<i>brr.</i> 44.5
(Vs. Leochares. xlv.)	<i>brr.</i> 45.6
(The Eroticus. lxi.)	<i>brr.</i> 33
(The Epitaphius. lx.)	<i>brr.</i> 11.9

## THE PROEMS

[The table gives the number of the proem, the number of (Oxford) lines, the number of *breves*, and the rate per hundred.]

i 25-1- 4	xi 13-0- 0
ii 26-2- 7.7	xii 16-3-19
iii 9-0- 0	xiii 12-0- 0
iv 11-1- 9	xiv 19-2-10.5
v 20-1- 5	xv 15-1- 6.6
vi 18-1- 5.5	xvi 13-1- 7.7
vii 18-0- 0	xvii 13-1- 7.7
viii 19-1- 5.3	xviii 14-1- 7
ix 18-0- 0	xix 13-1- 8
x 17-1- 5.8	xx 17-0- 0

xxi	35—2— 5.7	xxxix	19—1— 5
xxii	17—2—11.8	xl	19—2—10
xxiii	18—1— 5.6	xli	26—3—12
xxiv	33—1— 3	xlii	16—0— 0
xxv	24—1— 4	xliii	16—0— 0
xxvi	22—0— 0	xliv	17—2—12
xxvii	13—2—15	xlvi	26—0— 0
xxviii	18—0— 0	xlvi	32—0— 0
xxix	20—3—15	xlvi	18—0— 0
xxx	22—0— 0	xlvi	21—2— 9.5
xxxi	17—1— 5.9	xlvi	24—0— 0
xxxii	30—0— 0	l	25—2— 8
xxxiii	22—1— 4.5	li	9—1—11
xxxiv	26—3—12	lii	13—0— 0
xxxv	30—1— 3.3	lii	35—3— 8.6
xxxvi	16—2—13	liv	9—1—11
xxxvii	14—0— 0	lv	24—1— 4
xxxviii	22—2— 9	lvi	25—3—12

## THE EPISTLES

i	112— 7—6.2	iv	80—3— 3.75
ii	173—14—8	v	34—9—26
iii	295—11—3.7	vi	16—5—31

THE RATE OF BREVES IN OTHER WRITERS, FOR COMPARISON  
WITH THAT OF DEMOSTHENES

Thucydides. The Funeral Oration of Pericles. 220 (Oxford) lines; *brr.* 110. Rate 50 per cent.

Lysias. Vs. Eratosthenes. First 300 lines; *brr.* 48, 47, 47.

Isocrates. Panegyric. First 600 lines; *brr.* 41, 43, 35, 43, 38, 37. Average 39.5 per cent.

Isaeus. xi. 403 lines; *brr.* 40, 32, 41, 47 (+3 lines with 2 *brr.*). 40 per cent.

Isaeus. i. 321 lines; *brr.* 27, 39, 44 (+21 lines with 7 *brr.*). 36 per cent.

[Speech I shows the most definite attempt to avoid hiatus of any of Isaeus' speeches, and it is nearly the latest in time.]

Aeschines. Vs. Ctesiphon. First 500 lines, *brr.* 33, 36, 49, 45, 43. §§ 152.1—162.9, 100 lines, *brr.* 49. Last 200 lines, *brr.* 37, 32. Average 40.5 per cent.

Hyperides. Epitaphius. 259 lines; *brr.* 115. 44 per cent.

Hegesippus (?). On Halonnesus. 287 lines; *brr.* 126. 44 per cent.

Anonymous. Περὶ τῶν πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον Συνθηκῶν. 217 lines; *brr.* 114. 52 per cent.

The space limits of this article forbid the detailed discussion of the results here tabulated. It is plain that in the first two published speeches, xxvii and xxviii, there was no attempt to avoid *breves*; but with the third speech, xxix, the avoidance begins, and in a few years it has become fully established as a rule of composition. The public speeches naturally show a lower rate than those in private suits.

The speeches *Vs. Spudias*, xli, and *Vs. Callicles*, lv, generally recognized as genuine works of Demosthenes, offer no evidence of date save their style. They are almost universally regarded as youthful works of the orator, and as such their high rate of *breves* is not surprising; they belong with the speeches *Vs. Aphobus* and *Vs. Onetor*.

It is seen from the table that two speeches which cannot safely be ascribed to Demosthenes follow the rule of avoidance of *breves*. The *Epitaphius*, lx, probably by a writer after the time of Demosthenes, shows that at least one rhetorician knew this secret of the Demosthenic composition. The speech *Vs. Zenothemis*, xxxii (*brr.* 16.3), was delivered, and probably written, by a kinsman of Demosthenes; it is not surprising to find an imitation of this refinement of his style.

All other speeches of the corpus which on other grounds must be declared non-Demosthenic show a high rate of *breves*. On the other hand, almost all that are certainly Demosthenic have a low rate. Two offer difficulties which may be removed on the supposition of composite authorship; the detailed discussion of the grounds for such a hypothesis would be too long for this article. These are *Vs. Eubulides*, lvii (*brr.* 32), and *Vs. Timocrates*, xxiv (*brr.* 6.8 in one part, 37.5 in the remainder); both certainly show the hand of Demosthenes; but difficulties both of composition and of argument are best solved on the supposition that in each case the speaker received from Demosthenes only a part of his material.

The bearing of our study on the question of the genuineness of the *Fourth Philippic* is evident.

The results for the *Midiana*, a speech that manifestly lacks final revision, show that at an early period the habit of avoidance of *breves* had become so established with Demosthenes as to prevail even in the first draft of a speech, a fact that has not been sufficiently recognized.



The rate of *breves* in the *Proems* has about the same range as that of the speeches. Of course the small number of lines in each proem makes the percentage of *breves* less significant—there is more possibility of a chance absence or a chance abundance; yet it is certainly significant that so many are entirely free from *breves*. No one of the fifty-six proems has a rate so high as in itself to raise the question of genuineness.

*Epistles* v and vi, on the other hand, pass beyond the rate of Demosthenes' matured style. Whether the low rate of the other epistles is, like that of the *Epitaphius*, due to the skill of an imitator, well instructed in the niceties of the Demosthenic style, is a question that must be settled on other evidence.

Our study as a whole has shown that the avoidance of *breves* is a real characteristic of Demosthenes' style. A wide interval separates the least-polished product of his pen from the best work of his great contemporaries. Apparently there were some men of his own time—perhaps a narrow circle of personal friends—and some of a later time, who understood and imitated this peculiar device of prose composition, but none of the great writers were among them, and the principle did not find its way into the rhetorical treatises.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE